

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, 16, 18 and 21 are hereby being amended. No claims are being cancelled, and no new claims are being added. Support of the amendments is found within the specification and no new matter has been added.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 13-15 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claims 13 and 18 have been amended to more clearly indicate that the system (claims 13-15) and apparatus (claims 18-20) include at least a “processor and memory”, and are therefore not software per se. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 13-15 and 18-20 be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,003,773 to Hoennig et al. (hereinafter, “Hoennig”). To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose each and every element of the claim. Applicants submit that Hoennig does not disclose each and every element of claim 21 or claim 22, as amended, and therefore does not anticipate claim 21 or claim 22.

Independent claim 21, as amended, states:

A method of selecting an adapter for converting communication between a plurality of client programs and a server application comprising:

at a client abstraction layer, receiving a connection request from a client program to begin a new connection with the server application; and

executing a multi-stage selection process wherein the process comprises:

selecting a process from a plurality of processes based on the connection request; and

selecting the adapter from a plurality of adapters based on the selected process, wherein each adapter from the plurality of adapters is designed for use with a particular type of client.

(Claim 21, emphasis added). Accordingly, claim 21 refers to “receiving a connection request from a client program... [at a client abstraction layer]”. As shown in the example presented in FIG. 1 of Applicants’ specification, the client abstraction layer (with reference number 100) is an entity or component different and separate from the server application (having reference number 110). The purpose of the client abstraction layer is to select a client adapter that best suits communications between the client and the server. Therefore, as indicated in claim 21, a client directs a request to the client abstraction layer, and not directly to a particular server.

Hoennig does not disclose or suggest receiving a connection request from a client program at a client abstraction layer, as is presently claimed. It is clear from FIG. 3 of Hoennig that the client (i.e., user object 100) generates and sends a user request (e.g., operations 301 and 302) **directly to the server** (i.e., service object 101). In particular, the request generated and sent by the client (i.e., user object 100) of Hoennig is a “request for request-interface”. According to Hoennig, after receiving this initial request at a server (i.e., service object 101), the server generates an adapter request and sends the adapter request (operations 304 and 305) to an adapter manager 102. In turn, the adapter manager 102 obtains an adapter, and transmits information about the adapter back to the server (i.e., service object 101).

The scheme described by Hoennig is fundamentally different from the invention claimed by Applicants. Applicants’ claim 21 indicates a connection request is received at a client abstraction layer from a client program. Accordingly, a client does not send a connection request directly to a server, which is in contrast to what is disclosed by Hoennig. Communicating a request from a client program to a client abstraction layer, as claimed in claim 21, is consistent with a stated advantage of the invention – specifically, reducing the amount of data that needs to be transmitted between clients and servers. For instance, according to Hoennig, only after information about the interface has been transmitted back to the client (i.e., user object 100) can the client begin using the interface. Consequently, according to Hoennig, at a minimum two

requests are required to achieve any practical processing result between a client and a server – the first request results in establishing the proper interface, while a second request is required to utilize the selected interface to achieve any processing result.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants submit that claim 21 is not anticipated by Hoennig. As dependent claims 22-25 depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 21, these claims are also not anticipated by Hoennig. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 21 and 22.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

**Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-14, and 16-19**

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 11, 13-14 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,773 to Hoennig et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,644,720 to Boll et al. (hereinafter, “Boll”). Applicants submit that the rejection of the claims is unwarranted for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

**Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-11**

Independent claim 1, as amended, states:

A computer program product, tangibly embodied in a machine-readable storage device, the computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

identify at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer, where each selection data element specifies an adapter type, a client type, or data describing the client; and

use the selection data elements to select an adapter at the client abstraction layer to convert communication between an application running on the server and one or more client programs, the adapter being used by the client abstraction layer as an intermediary, the adapter hiding client-specific behavior from the

application running on the server, the adapter being designed for use with a particular client program.

(claim 1, emphasis added).

As indicated in claim 1, a client abstraction layer on a server receives a client request from a client. The client abstraction layer identifies selection data elements in the client request. In turn, the client abstraction layer uses the identified selection data elements to select an adapter for use with a particular client program.

Hoennig does not disclose or suggest the above claim features. In the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that step 304 of FIG. 3 and column 14, lines 42-45 and 52-59 of Hoennig disclose the claimed feature: “identify[ing] at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer.” Applicants respectfully disagree. It is clear from FIG. 3 of Hoennig that a user request for a request-interface is received (operation 303) at a server (i.e., service object 101), and not at a client abstraction layer, as is claimed in Applicants’ claim 1. According to Hoennig, the client (i.e., user object 100) communicates a direct request to the server (i.e., service object 101). As the client request is not directed to a client abstraction layer, it does not make sense that Hoennig disclose a client abstraction layer identifying data selection elements in a client request. Indeed this is the case – Hoennig does not disclose a client abstraction layer identifying data selection elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. Moreover, Hoennig does not disclose a client abstraction layer using selection data elements, identified at the client abstraction layer in a client request received at the client abstraction layer, to select an adapter.

For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Hoennig. Furthermore, because Boll does not disclose or suggest the claimed features described above, independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the the combination of Hoennig and Boll. As dependent claims 2-3, 5-7 and 9-11 depend upon independent claim 1, for the same reasons as stated above, these claims are also not obvious in view of Hoennig and Boll. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-11.

Claims 13 and 14

Independent claim 13 recites in part, “a client abstraction layer on the server operable to: identify one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer.” As described in greater detail above with respect to independent claims 1 and 21, Hoennig does not disclose or suggest a client abstraction layer identifying selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer, as is claimed. Instead, Hoennig discloses a client request being communicated from a client (i.e., user object 100) to a server (i.e., service object). As the client request is communicated from the client to the server according to Hoennig, it logically follows that Hoennig does not disclose or suggest a client abstraction layer that identifies selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. Because Boll does not disclose or suggest the above claim feature of claim 13, claim 13 is not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig and Boll. Furthermore, claim 14, which includes all of the claim limitations of claim 13 from which it depends, is not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig and Boll. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 13 and 14.

Claims 16 and 17

Independent claim 16 recites in part, “identifying at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer”. As described in greater detail above with respect to independent claims 1 and 21, Hoennig does not disclose or suggest a client abstraction layer identifying selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. Instead, Hoennig discloses a client request being communicated from a client (i.e., user object 100) to a server (i.e., service object). As the client request is communicated from the client to the server according to Hoennig, it logically follows that Hoennig does not disclose or suggest a client abstraction layer that identifies selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. Because Boll does not disclose or suggest the above claim feature of claim 16, claim 16 is not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig and Boll. Furthermore, claim 17, which includes all of the claim limitations of claim 16 from which it depends, is not obvious in view of the combination of

Hoennig and Boll. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 16 and 17.

Claims 18 and 19

Independent claim 18 recites in part, “means for identifying at a client abstraction layer on a server having a processor and memory, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer.” As described in greater detail above with respect to independent claims 1 and 21, Hoennig does not disclose or suggest a client abstraction layer identifying selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. Instead, Hoennig discloses a client request being communicated from a client (i.e., user object 100) to a server (i.e., service object). As the client request is communicated from the client to the server according to Hoennig, it logically follows that Hoennig does not disclose or suggest a client abstraction layer that identifies selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. Because Boll does not disclose or suggest the above claim feature of claim 18, claim 18 is not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig and Boll. Furthermore, claim 19, which includes all of the claim limitations of claim 18 from which it depends, is not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig and Boll. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 18 and 19.

Claims 4 and 10

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,773 to Hoennig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,644,720 to Boll et al. (hereinafter, “Boll”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947 to Kanevsky. Applicants submit that the rejection of the claims is unwarranted for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 10 are dependent upon claim 1, and therefore include all of the claim features recited in claim 1. As described above with respect to claim 1, Hoennig does not disclose or suggest identifying at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. This claim feature is not

disclosed by Boll or Kanevsky. Consequently, for at least this reason, claims 4 and 10 are not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig, Boll and Kanevsky. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 4 and 10.

Claims 8, 15 and 20

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 8, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,773 to Hoennig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,644,720 to Boll et al. (hereinafter, "Boll"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0047383 to Dutta. Applicants submit that the rejection of the claims is unwarranted for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 15 and 20 are dependent upon claims 1, 13 and 18, respectively. As described above with respect to claims 1, 13 and 18 Hoennig does not disclose or suggest identifying at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. This claim feature is not disclosed by Boll or Dutta. Consequently, for at least this reason, claims 8, 15 and 20 are not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig, Boll and Dutta. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 8, 15 and 20.

Claim 12

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,773 to Hoennig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,644,720 to Boll et al. (hereinafter, "Boll"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033356A to Tran et al. (hereinafter, "Tran"). Applicants submit that the rejection of the claim is unwarranted for the reason set forth below. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is dependent upon claim 1. As described above with respect to claim 1, Hoennig does not disclose or suggest identifying at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. This claim feature is not disclosed by Boll or Tran. Consequently, for at least this reason, claim 12 is

not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig, Boll and Tran. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 12.

Claims 23-25

In the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,773 to Hoennig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,644,720 to Boll et al. (hereinafter, "Boll"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0225656 to Sarkar. Applicants submit that the rejection of the claims is unwarranted for the reasons set forth below. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 23-25 are dependent upon claim 21. As described above with respect to claim 21, Hoennig does not disclose or suggest identifying at a client abstraction layer on a server, one or more selection data elements in a client request received at the client abstraction layer. This claim feature is not disclosed by Boll or Karkar. Consequently, for at least this reason, claims 23-25 are not obvious in view of the combination of Hoennig, Boll and Sarkar. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 23-25.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.



PATENT  
U.S. Appln No. 10/658,683  
Docket No. 000005-006100US

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 408-244-6319.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Chad S. Walsh, Reg.#43235/  
Chad R. Walsh

FOUNTAINHEAD LAW GROUP P.C.  
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 509  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel: 408-244-6319